DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 789 UD 020 563

AUTHOR Silverman, Dorothy; Rank, Stanley
TITLE Title I. Final Evaluation Report, Summer 1979.
INSTITUTION Community School District 8, Bronx, N.Y.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 56p.; Not available in paper copy due to smudged print.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Compensatory Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Parent Participation; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Remedial Mathematics; *Remedial Programs; *Remedial Reading; *Summer Programs; Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Impact Aid; *New York (Bronx)

ABSTRACT

This document presents evaluations of summer Title I and Impact Aid reading, writing, and mathematics programs and their Parental Involvement component. The Title I and Impact Aid programs are briefly described as are the evaluation procedures, program activities, program materials, interviews with staff members, process evaluation findings, and recommendations. Quantitative evaluation was accomplished by a pre/posttest design utilizing the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. These findings are presented separately. The Parental Involvement Component evaluation includes information on background, procedure, findings, observations, and recommendations. Programs were found to be functioning well and recycling was recommended in all cases. Quantitatively, 47.8% of participating students made gains in reading while 33.6% maintained their initial levels. Test results for the remaining students indicated losses in achievement. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187789

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 8

Max Messer, Community Superintendent

Final Evaluation Report - Title I

Summer 1979

Function	Number	Project Code
Title I	~~5047~~ 5001 -08-	01601
Impact Aid	~~5047~~ 5001 -08-	08701

Dorothy Silverman

District Evaluator

Stanley Bank

Evaluation Consultant

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ron Edmonds
NYC Bd of Ed
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 20563

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

COMMUNITY SCHOOL BOARD - DISTRICT 8

Julian J. Misiurski, Jr., President

Dennis R. Coleman, Vice President

Rose Foley, Secretary

Anne L. Schuster, Treasurer

Maria T. Colon

Geraldine Inserra

Kevin O'Rourke Moore

Saundra Taylor

Glòria J. Vincent

Max Messer, Community Superintendent

Contents

Acknowledgments	iii
Title I	1
The Program	2
Evaluation Procedures	6
Program Activities	7
Materials	14
Interviews	15
Findings	17
Recommendations	20
Impact Aid	22
The Program	23
Evaluation Procedures	26
Program Activities	27
Materials	31
Interviews	32
Findings	33
Recommendations	35
Parent Involvement Component	37
Background	38
Procedure	38
Findings	39
Observations	41
Recommendations	42

Achievement

Testing Procedure 45

Findings 45

Appendix 47

Parent Checklist 48

Acknowledgments

Evaluation of the Summer Title I and Impact Aid Reading Programs was directed and supervised by Dorothy Silverman, District 8 evaluator. The narrative report was prepared by Stanley Bank of Lehman College who served as the evaluation consultant for the program. Jean DePesa, Chairperson of the Parent Program Component Committee of the project, contributed the section on the Parent Program Team. Assessment of achievement was provided by Dorothy Silverman who also edited the manuscript.

Title I

Summer Reading Program

Component No. 01603

Function No. ~~5047~~ 57001-08

Component No. 01603
Function No. ~~80FSUCV-08~~

THE PROGRAM

The District 8 Summer Reading School Program was an ESEA Title I funded program that operated from July 9 through August 17, 1979, in Community School District 8, Bronx, New York. It provided instruction in reading skills, in writing, and in reading in the content area of mathematics to 838 pupils in grades one through nine at twenty sites in the district. The participating pupils were distributed as indicated below:

SCHOOL	GRADES	PUPILS
PS 36	3-6	36
39	3-6	36
48	3-5	62
60	3-6	36
62	3-5	37
69	2-5	36
72	3-5	57
75	3-6	36
93	1-3	36
119	1-5	41
146	1-5	52
152	4-6	36
IS 52	5-8	50
74	5-8	36
131	5-8	36
174	5-8	65
JHS 101	7-9	36
120	7-9	36
123	7-9	52
125	7-9	36

An additional 231 pupils were served in schools funded by Impact Aid funds, making for a total of 1069 pupils in the reading programs.

The students were served by teachers, paraprofessionals acting as classroom educational assistants, and school aides distributed as follows, as well as by two coordinators and two secretaries based at the District Office.

SCHOOL	TEACHER	PARAPROFESSIONALS	AIDES
PS 36	3	3	1
39	3	3	1
48	3	1	1
60	3	3	1
62	3	3	1
69	3	3	1
72	3	1	2
75	3	1	2
93	3	3	1
100		1	
107		3	
119	3	3	1
130		1	
138		1	
140		3	
146	3	1	2
152	3	3	1
IS 52	3	1	1
74	3	3	1
131	3	3	1
174	4	2	1
JHS 101	3	3	1
120	3	3	1
123	3	1	1
125	3	3	1
TOTAL	61	54	23

All participating pupils met the criterion of Title I eligibility and all teachers selected for the program were appropriately trained and experienced. P.S. 100, 107, 130, 138, and 140 were the Impact Aid sites. As indicated, the paraprofessionals at those sites were funded through Title I.

Information to parents about the availability of the programs was disseminated through letters, announcements, and local newspapers. Information was also disseminated by letters to non-public schools. All program sites were open to pupils from non-public schools; at the seven sites visited by the evaluation consultant, the teachers identified ten students from non-public schools in regular attendance.

The program was designed to sustain the achievement of Title I students beyond the regular school year and to further remediation in reading and language arts for students in school-year Title I programs. The District is aware of the importance of eliminating the summer loss that regularly reduces the impact of remedial programs and has undertaken this program with the primary goal of combatting that set-back. A holistic, three-pronged approach to basic skills instruction provided an interdisciplinary, integrated experience in language learning. For linguistically deficient pupils, an integrated approach to learning reading and writing is necessary as a means of increasing skill and fluency in both. Accordingly, each day, work was provided in reading, with the particular elements stressed based on student need; in writing, with the emphasis on daily practice in exposition and narrative, sentence structure, correctness, and revision; and in mathematics, with problem solving through the skills needed for reading in that content area. Students worked on learning to read, interpret, and explain mathematical word problems; a lack in this

reading skill tends to hold students below the level of their computational ability.

Pre-service training was given teachers and supervisors in which an overview of the program material on planning and information on evaluation were presented. Sessions in each of the curricular areas were provided: one in the WEDGE curriculum, a new program of daily writing activities developed by the Cantal Board for the intermediate and secondary grades; in reading skills instruction; and in word processing problems in mathematics. A session for supervisors in Time Keeping, Plan Books, and Observations was also provided.

The program provided each teacher with a copy of the WEDGE curriculum and with a compilation by the District of mathematics word-processing activities. Other materials and supplies were to be made available through the district's principals, Title I coordinators, and the teachers themselves, who were encouraged to provide materials from their school-year programs.

Instruction was provided for three hours per day, five days per week. Teachers kept individual pupil folders containing classroom work, pupil profiles, lesson plans and attendance records. Provision was made for information about student progress in the summer program to be sent to the students' home schools at the end of August.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Formal Objectives

Students in all grades were to achieve mastery of five objectives as measured by the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test at appropriate levels. A pretest was administered at the start of the program and a posttest at the close. The entire test was administered at each testing session.

Informal Instruments and Procedures

Seven site visits were made. Observations and interview summaries were recorded on District 8 Field Visitation Report Forms. Informal interviews were held, as well, with teachers, paraprofessionals, pupils, and coordinators. The sites for visitation were selected at random. The first field visit was made on July 19, 1979.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

While the program guidelines and objectives were straightforward, activities directed at fulfilling these objectives varied. A sample of the activities observed in the seven schools visited, together with comments, follows.

In the areas of reading, writing, and reading in mathematics, all teachers observed were engaged in instruction directly related to the objectives of the program. This fact reflects positively on the training, the supervision, and the staff selection in the program.

Reading

1. Pupils worked individually in kits and workbooks while the teacher worked with one child at a time. There were assignments on the board. The paraprofessional moved around the room checking and correcting student work.
   The class was well managed, and the staff worked as a team engaged in individual instruction.
2. Pupils copied vocabulary words and definitions, then discussed the words. The class worked as a group on distinguishing fact from opinion, using oral reading.
   The discussion of vocabulary work was well done, and the children learned to use dictionaries. Reading aloud was for a purpose, and could have been useful for diagnosis, but the teacher did not take advantage of that opportunity. The vocabulary work showed teacher awareness of pupil needs, but did not emphasize the use of language as opposed to mere definition.

3. Upon coming into the room, pupils went to their folders, selected materials, and did independent work while the paraprofessional circulated among them. The teacher presented a group lesson, the patterned reading of words from the board, aimed at speed in identifying sight words. The lesson then moved to word analysis and, finally, to meaning.

   The teacher was attentive to what he was attempting to accomplish with the activity. But immediate (i.e., unmediated) word identification should be practiced in sentences as well as from lists to develop use of semantic redundancy and feature identification beyond the word level.

4. The whole class worked with the "ch" sound at the beginning and end of words: the class spelled and read aloud, wrote, read their writing. This was followed by an exercise in which the children colored pictures differently based upon the placement of the sound in the words.

   This is useful if the children need work in aural discrimination. As reading instruction, it is more probable that learning was in the area of the differences than in the similarities; chain, chair, cherry. Linguistic readers use this technique extensively. In the coloring exercise, the directions were not understood by some children.

5. A game was used to reinforce letter-sound relationships.

   As reinforcement, games provide reward and motivation.

5. The children worked in workbooks. As they finished, they turned to individual assignments in folders. The teacher moved around the room, clearly aware of individual progress.

   It is a system of providing for group and individual instruction simultaneously. Some students, however, did not need the workbook exercise at all (in Merrill's New Diagnostic Workbook Series) and could have been sent directly to individual work.

7. A phonics lesson on silent "e." was given during instruction. The children worked in workbooks as the paraprofessional circulated among them. Then the children worked on their own, asking for help as needed.

   The children were working individually, at their own pace, but the material was not individualized.

8. As children entered the rooms, they went directly to the areas to which they had been assigned by groups. These were formed based on needs as shown by the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. Each area had appropriate kits, tapes, and workbooks; the children knew what to do and began work at once.

   This is fine, planned individualized instruction. Although the children worked in groups, the groups were fluid as children progressed and went on to work on other areas of need.

Mathematics

1. Some children were at the board, others at their seats; they worked at numerals, Roman numerals, and numbers expressed as words. The class evidently was in need of this

instruction. Then the whole group moved to a page in the folders with a review of key words (from program supplied materials).

The teacher was patient, encouraging, understanding.

When the class moved to the folders, some of the students could have been assigned other work.

2. Pupils translated large numbers from language to numerals, from numerals to language.

This exercise was easy for some, difficult for others, indicating the necessity to individualize instruction. There were only fourteen students in the room, so individualization was clearly possible, even without a paraprofessional. As would be expected, additional teacher training is indicated in the field of reading in content areas: "Nine places indicate millions" may be true, but is misleading in its incompleteness.

3. Pupils translated word problems to "examples," i.e., formulas.

This active process is supported by psycholinguistic theory. The ability to generate the formulas is related to the ability to generate sentences essential to skilled reading.

4. The teacher used corrected work to give individual assignments, then moved to whole-group instruction: "addend + addend = sum:" The teacher led the students in deriving "sum - addend + addend;" helped children move linguistically from "take away" to "minus;" and involved children physically, showing sum with arms, demonstrating balance.

This was an excellent use of the individualized diagnostic prescriptive assignment at the start. The whole group lesson was well motivated and dramatic, holding the children's interest. But like all teacher-centered activities, it left some students behind. When a student was unable to answer a question, the teacher merely repeated it without making it less abstract or less difficult. The result was a confused student pretending to understand.

5. Use of computing a calendar: "today is one more than yesterday." Ordinal and cardinal numbers, use of hyphen in writing numbers, key word such as "and, more than, sum" using number on register and number attending were also practiced.

   A lesson was made out of classroom management, flowing easily from one idea to the next, from new learning to reinforcement. It was a very well presented group lesson.

6. A game was used to help children attend to numbers. The aim of this activity is very important, and the children, without realizing it, thought they were merely having fun.

7. The whole class worked with words used in reasoning with groups: dozen, score, gross.

   These are important linguistic elements in mathematics and the whole-group approach seemed appropriate.

8. A newspaper weather forecast was used in conjunction with the dictionary as children looked up math-related words and used them in their own sentences. The teacher moved around the room offering help when it was needed.

This is an excellent approach to language learning through an integrated reading-writing language arts approach. The teacher was trained in teaching English as a second language. There were, perhaps, too many words for the children to deal with at one time.

Writing

1. WEDGE material was on the board. The teacher engaged the students in evaluating a reading/writing/critical thinking activity. The class then moved to individual writing, self-assigned, with teacher assistance.
   The discussion was expertly led and very closely attended. The relationship between group and individual work was clear. When a child wrote, the teacher corrected it with him, and then the child re-wrote. This method is supported by research (Richard Beach, "The Effects of Between-Draft Teacher Evaluation Versus Student Self-evaluation on High School Students' Revising of Rough Drafts," Research in the Teaching of English, XIII (May, 1979) 2, 111-119). Revision might have been better than mere correction.
2. Children read limericks aloud, getting the "feeling" of the rhyme, and content. They wrote their own limericks, and were consciously reading preparatory to writing. The reading-writing relationship was clear to teacher and students.

3. The teacher worked on kinds of sentences, declarative, imperative, interrogative, with students in need of work in English as a second language. After instruction and discussion, the children went to their workbooks.
   While not individualized, the work seemed appropriate and challenging to all participants. The teacher gave additional attention to two truly non-English speakers in the class. In the workbooks (Merril's Blueprints from the "Building Language Power" series, the children needed to answer on separate sheets of paper rather than in the book itself. This gave an ad hoc duality to the activity.
4. After the children wrote in their diaries, they went to individually assigned writing tasks. As those tasks were completed, they read aloud to the teacher, who corrected their work for a final draft.
   There was an advantage to the children reading their own writing aloud as the link between the activities was clarified for the students.

MATERIALS

Because teachers and principals, along with Title I reading coordinators, supplied all the materials for the reading aspect of the program, the evaluator inventoried several rooms to ascertain the range, quality, and appropriateness of the materials used. While the quantity of materials varied from room to room, it was never less than satisfactory. Range and appropriateness were excellent, as can be seen by this sample listing:

Barnell-Lofts	Specific Skills Series
SRA	Reading Labs (3 levels)
	Reading for Understanding
McGraw-Hill	Reading for Concepts
	New Practice Readers
Noble and Noble	Springboards
McCall-Crabbs	Standard Test Lessons in Reading
Scholastic	Scope
	Reading Skills
Globe	Reading Road to Writing
	Dictionaries

The New York Daily News was supplied to grades five and above.

INTERVIEWS

Twenty-two teachers were interviewed. Their most cogent comments are as follows:

1. There was good cooperation by the principal and by the home school in materials, supplies, and rooms.
2. Groups were too large. There was a large turnout increased by word-of-mouth which resulted in a waiting list. Additional staff was hired as soon as possible. It was difficult to hire para-professionals for the summer program.
3. More material should have been supplied by the program.
4. The training sessions were useful.
5. The supervision was good.
6. Children clearly benefited from the program.
7. WEDGE materials were useful.
8. The program should have been organized earlier. The point of this comment is that it would have been easier for these teachers have assembled the appropriate materials had they known of the their assignments earlier.

The comments by paraprofessionals were uncritically positive about their role in the program and about the program itself.

All the students interviewed said that they were learning in the program, and that they enjoyed it; one said that while the programs was fine, the summer should be her own.

Two district principals were in charge of the program. One spoke of how much the program was needed, stressing the reading in mathematics aspects. He lauded the other principal's initiative in getting the newspaper for the children, and said he believed it helped them get into the habit of reading. He felt that the bi-weekly newsletters containing the children's work and issued separately by each school, the weekly commendations, and the report cards issued twice during the summer, all helped involve parents in their children's learning and increased pupil motivation immeasurably.

FINDINGS

Discrepancy Analysis: Instructionally, the program was implemented exactly as described in the project proposal. In staffing the target population, it was implemented as described in the proposal as modified.

Classroom Observation: The following areas were rated on a range of 1 to 3, poor to excellent. "None" was averaged as 0 only where it was observed as a clear lack.

1. Materials	Rating
a. Amount	2.7 Excellent
b. Variety	2.9 Excellent
c. Suitability	3.0 Excellent

Since materials were assembled by the staff and provided by year round personnel, these ratings indicate the high degree of cooperation afforded the project and the diligence of the project staff.

2. Room 2.3 Good

Almost all the rooms provided were physically suitable, although some were enormous or dingy. The problems most evident were in the suitability of the arrangement for individual/small group work. When a room is set up with all the desks in rows facing front, small group work appears temporary rather than central. A few of the rooms were not pleasantly decorated and were not inviting places in which to work.

3 Records

a.	Teacher Logs	3.0 Excellent
b.	Lesson Plans	3.0 Excellent
c.	Pupil Profiles	2.0 Good
d.	Pupil Attendance Records	2.9 Excellent

Records and plans were very well kept by the staff, indicating good training and supervision, as well as good work by the aides. The pupil profiles were rated lower because little or no information had been submitted from the regular school year program on the students.

4. Training 2.3 Good

Many teachers felt that training could have been more extensive.

5. Instruction

a.	Small Groups	3.0 Excellent
b.	Individualized	2.2 Good
c.	Paraprofessional	2.7 Excellent (when observed in direct instruction)

Many teachers need additional training in individualizing instruction effectively, using activity centers. Paraprofessionals were well supervised and relationships between paraprofessionals and classroom teachers seemed excellent.

Observed Strengths

1. Reasonable and important program objectives.
2. Quality of instruction and supervision.
3. Organization, which was left to individual schools: some departmentalized, some not, according to individual staffs. All teachers reported satisfaction with organization.
4. Grouping of students in different schools was different, but all were viable and educationally sound.
5. Paraprofessional availability was different in different schools, but was always based on instructional needs.

Observed Weaknesses

1. In some cases, room environment.
2. Techniques of individualized instruction.
3. Program (rather than individual) provision for Non-English speakers or others in need of ESL instruction.
4. The number of paraprofessionals actually working in the program was too small.
5. Training is needed in reading in the content areas, in individualization of instruction, in techniques for teaching writing, and in the integration of reading and writing skills.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the program be recycled in the 1980 summer school period.
2. While principals, teachers, and coordinators assembled appropriate materials, it was not always possible for a teacher to have some of the material of his or her choice, or to have fresh materials which were new to the children. In some cases, workbooks which were borrowed or were needed for the school year could not be written in. It is recommended that some program materials be provided, especially of the consumable type. A small fund should also be set aside to permit teachers to purchase individual items after the teacher meets the children.
3. It is recommended that the idea of reading in the content areas be extended beyond mathematics, especially to science in the upper grades.
4. It is recommended that the pre-service training be extended, especially in the following areas:
    a. Teaching reading in the appropriate content areas.
    b. Sentence combining as a method of improving reading and writing
    c. Writing activities for the lower grades (Note Roach Van Allen's work in Language Experience).
    d. Individualized instruction, including diagnosis and follow-up activities, the management of activity centers in the classroom, the creation of individualized materials.

e. Interpretation of diagnostic test results.

f. Reading and writing as linked to linguistic processes in language development and education.

g. Possible perceptual difficulties and diagnostic facilities for referral.

5. A paraprofessional should be available in each room at all times. Although it has proved difficult to hire paraprofessionals for summer work, the difficulty is now known in advance. There should also be paraprofessional training and training in the above areas as appropriate.

6. It is recommended that the district establish a system for gathering information about students from regular and Title I school-year teachers.

Title I

Impact Aid

Summer Reading Program

Component No. 08701

Function No. ~~5044~~ 5001-08

Component No. 08701
Function No. ~~3044~~ 5001-08 –

THE PROGRAM

The District 8 Summer Reading School Program (Impact Aid) extended the ESEA Title I funded program that operated from July 9 through August 17, 1979, in Community School District 8, Bronx, New York by 231 participating pupils distributed in 5 schools as indicated below:

SCHOOL	GRADE	PUPILS
PS 100	3-5	67
107	3-6	36
130	3-6	49
138	3-6	43
140	3-6	36

The students were served by teachers, paraprofessionals acting as classroom educational assistants, funded by Title I, and school aides distributed as follows, as well as sharing with the Title I program the services of two principals-in-charge and two secretaries based at the District Office.

SCHOOL	TEACHER	AIDES
PS 100	4	1
107	3	1
130	3	1
138	3	1
140	3	1
TOTAL	16	5

All participating pupils met the criterion of Title I eligibility and all personnel selected for the program were appropriately trained and experienced.

Information to parents about the availability of the program was disseminated through letters, announcements, and local newspapers. Information was also disseminated by letters to non-public schools. All program sites were open to pupils from non-public schools; at the three sites visited by the evaluation consultant, the teachers identified nine students from non-public schools in regular attendance.

The program was under the same guidelines as the Title I program. It was designed to sustain the achievement of the students beyond the regular school year and to further remediation in reading and language arts for Title I eligible students. The District is aware of the importance of eliminating the summer loss in proficiency that regularly reduces the impact of remedial programs and has undertaken this program in an attempt to combat that loss. A holistic, three-pronged approach to basic skills instruction provided an interdisciplinary, integrated experience in language learning. Especially for linguistically deprived children, an integrated approach to the skills of reading and writing is necessary to increase skill and fluency in both. Each day, work was provided in reading, with the particular elements stressed based on student need; in writing, with the emphasis on daily practice in

exposition and narrative, sentence structure, correctness, and revision; and in mathematics with problem solving through the skills needed for reading in that content area. Students worked on learning to read, to interpret, and to explain mathematical word problems; a lack in this reading skill holds students below the level of their computational ability.

Pre-service training sessions for teachers were provided, giving an overview of the program, of materials on planning, and information on evaluation. Sessions in each of the curricular areas were provided: one in the WEDGE curriculum, a new program of daily writing activities developed by the Central Board for the intermediate and secondary grades; in reading skills instruction, and in word processing problems in mathematics.

The program provided each teacher with a copy of the WEDGE curriculum and with a compilation by the District of mathematical word processing activities. Other materials and supplies were to be made through the district's principals, Title I coordinators, and the teachers themselves, who were encouraged to provide materials from their school-year programs.

Instruction was provided, as specified in the proposal, for three hours per day, five days per week. Teachers kept individual pupil folders containing classroom work, pupil profiles, and lesson plans and attendance records. Provision was made for information about student progress in the summer program to be available to the students' home schools.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Formal Objectives

Students in all grades were to achieve mastery of five objectives as measured by the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test at appropriate levels. A pretest was administered at the start of the program and a posttest at the close. The entire test was administered at each testing session.

Informal Instruments and Procedures

Seven site visits were made. Observation and interview summaries were recorded on District 8 Field Visitation Report Forms. Informal interviews were held as well, with teachers, paraprofessionals, pupils and coordinators. The sites for visitations were selected at random. The first field visit was made on July 19, 1979.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

While the program guidelines and objectives were straightforward, the particular activities directed at fulfilling those objectives varied. A sample of the activities observed in the three schools visited, together with comments, follows.

All teachers were engaged in instruction directly related to the objectives of the program. This fact reflects positively on the training, the supervision, and the staff selection in the program.

Reading

1. Reading and using picture clues for inference (in Bank Sheet Readers). There was both silent and oral reading by the children.
2. The children worked on short paragraphs from the board using the cloze procedure.

   The cloze procedure is one of the few reading skills activities that does not separate the performance of the task from the reading itself. The teacher then led an excellent discussion on the possible choices.
3. Under the direction of the teacher, children read cartoons and cartoon panels, discussing them in small groups. They were working toward creating individual stories with pictures. When the writing began, the teacher circulated among them, helping and questioning. Children read their completed work aloud.

This activity which could have been listed under writing was a model of an integrated approach to reading and writing including speaking and listening, as well. The group work was well directed, and the independent work was truly individual, with guidance, self-motivation, and individual comment and follow-up.

Writing

1. Children wrote in their journals. The teacher then assigned both structural and free writing assignments.
   This was a potentially fine activity, very well conceived, but the explanations to the class were very lengthy. The children were on the verge of activity for a long time.
2. Letter writing led to instruction about vocabulary of politicial divisions--city, state, borough, county.
   The lesson was addressed to observed needs of the students. The class had agreed that their country was the Bronx, obviously in a confusion with county.

Mathematics

1. "Gobble-de-Gook" stories, supplied by the district, were used for learning key words--"altogether, how many in all, between have left" and many more as clues to the necessary computational process.
   The group lesson was appropriate for this activity. The next step should have been a fully spelled-out series of word problems so that practice in the use of redundancy in reading was obtained in the context of real sentences.

That activity was observed in other classes.

2. Reading numbers as words and numerals constituted the lesson. Most children were interested and challenged. This was a good group lesson, but some children should have been exempt from this activity and allowed to do individual assignments. The teacher of this class had kept excellent records of individual progress in kits and resultant assignments which could be used for such individualization.

3. The whole class worked on math symbols hidden in a picture. Some students were involved with this as a game, while others remained bored and apathetic.
Some children might have learned new symbols, but one might question the value of this activity except as reward or motivation. Psycholinguistic theory holds that symbol/word recognition is dependent upon feature recognition in contexts, which makes this activity highly artificial . Fifteen children, ranging from third to sixth grade, might present too wide a range for any whole-group activity in a class size easily suited to individual and small-group instruction.

4. Students worked on two-step problems from ditto masters. The children were challenged. This activity was presented when the group was ready to use the skills learned in reading one-step problems.

5. The teacher attempted to explain a linguistic problem: 179-foot tower is 179 feet high. The teacher was unable to explain this point coherently. Training is needed in reading in the content areas, a field new to many experienced teachers.

6. Children converted paragraphs to charts.
This was an excellent activity which showed understanding of reading as an active process.

7. The teacher reproduced a fast-food menu on the board. One child chose lunch. The class computed his total cost, and the change he would receive from various amounts of money.
The children were enthusiastic, but this activity could have been improved for use with different groups able to handle problems of various degrees of difficulty and sophistication: how much does each pay if x number split the check equally? How much more does Carla spend than Jose? If you have a Big Mac and a shake, what else can you get if you have x dollars?

MATERIALS

Because teachers and principals, along with Title I reading coordinators, supplied all the materials for the reading aspect of the program, the evaluator inventoried several rooms to ascertain the range, quality, and appropriateness of the materials used. While the quantity of materials varied from room to room, it was never less than satisfactory. Range and appropriateness were excellent, as can be seen by this sample listing:

Globe	Mini-Units in Reading
	Real Stories
	Write Now
	Writing Sense
Laidlaw	Target Reading
Board of Education	Intensive Reading Program
Scholastic	Real World English

Thorndike Barnhart Beginning Dictionary.

INTERVIEWS

Ten teachers were interviewed. Their most significant observations were as follows:

1. The training was good. The consensus was that there should be more training, and that the most useful training was in the mathematics area.
2. The children in the program exhibited pride in their achievement and enthusiasm for the program.
3. Groups were too large. There was a large turnout of pupils which resulted in a waiting list. Additional staff was hired.
4. There should have been more information available on incoming students.
5. The mathematics reading materials supplied were excellent.
6. Principals were cooperative about supplying materials.

The paraprofessionals were enthusiastic about the program and about their work. Cooperation between teachers and paraprofessionals seemed excellent.

Children at each school said that they felt they were learning in the program.

FINDINGS

Discrepancy Analysis: Instructionally, the program is implemented exactly as described in the project proposal. In staffing and target population, it is implemented as in the proposal as modified.

Classroom Observation: The following areas were rated on a range of 1 to 3, poor to excellent. "None" was averaged as 0 only when it was observed as a lack.

1. Materials

a.	Amount	2.6 Excellent
b.	Variety	2.8 Excellent
c.	Suitability	3.0 Excellent

Since materials had been assembled by the staff and provided by the regular year round personnel, these ratings indicate the high degree of cooperation afforded the project and the diligence of the project staff.

2. Room 2.4 Good

Some rooms were not suitably arranged for individual and small group work. A few of the rooms were in need of decoration to be made pleasant and inviting work areas.

3. Records

a.	Teacher Logs	3.0 Excellent
b.	Teacher Lesson Plans	3.0 Excellent
c.	Pupil Profiles	2.0 Good
d.	Pupil Attendance Records	3.0 Excellent

Records and plans were very well kept by the staff, indicating good training and supervision, as well as good work by the aides. The pupil profiles were rated lower because of the paucity of information available from the regular school year programs.

4. Training (as reported) 2.7 Excellent

The consensus was that training should have been more extensive.

5. Instruction

a.	Small groups	2.7 Excellent
b.	Individualized	2.1 Good
c.	Paraprofessionals	2.5 Excellent (when observed in direct instruction)

Some teachers needed additional training in individualizing instruction effectively. The supervision of paraprofessionals was excellent.

Observed Strengths The same as the Title I Report, with the additional observation that one teacher was concerned about perceptual problems and recommended to some parents that their children be diagnosed at appropriate centers.

Observed Weaknesses The same as Title I Report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the program be recycled in the 1980 summer school period.
2. While principals, teachers, and coordinators assembled appropriate materials, it was not always possible for a teacher to have some of the material of his or her choice, or to have fresh materials which were new to the children. It is recommended that some program materials be provided, especially of the consumable type. A small fund should also be set aside to permit teachers to purchase individual items after they meet the children.
3. It is recommended that the idea of reading in the content area be extended beyond mathematics, especially to science in the upper grades.
4. It is recommended that the pre-service training be extended, especially in the following areas:
   a. Teaching reading in the appropriate content area.
   b. Sentence combining as a method of improving reading and writing.
   c. Writing activities for the lower grades.
   d. Individualized instruction, including diagnosis and follow-up activities, the management of activity centers in the classroom, the creation of individualized materials.
   e. Interpretation of diagnostic test results.
   f. Reading and writing as linked linguistic processes in language development and education.

g. Noting possible perceptual difficulties and diagnostic facilities for referral.

5. If Impact Aid funds are used to hire paraprofessionals, a paraprofessional should be available in each room at all times. There should also be appropriate paraprofessional or team training in the above areas.

6. It is recommended that the District establish a system for gathering information about students from the regular year's programs to help create suitable individualized programs during the summer program.

PARENT PARTICIPATION COMPONENT

BACKGROUND

The Parent Monitoring Team was formed on July 11, 1979 as an outgrowth of parent activities sponsored by the Title I Parent Involvement Program.

The six member team reviewed the District 8 Summer Reading Proposal and interviewed the two supervisors of the program. In addition, they familiarized themselves with curriculum materials developed by the District staff for the summer program. A parent checklist was developed based on the information provided to the team. This checklist also included areas to be reviewed as expressed by the Parent Advisory Committee members at the time the proposal was originally reviewed.

The parent team scheduled visits for August 6, 9, and 10 at a sampling of the sites in various parts of the district as well as the range of grades involved (Elementary, I.S., and J.H.S.). Ten sites were officially visited by the team. It should also be noted that almost every site was visited by the parent association leaders of the respective schools involved.

PROCEDURE

Every class at each site was visited by a team member. Teachers, para-professionals, aides, and students were interviewed. Monitoring team members took note of things such as the adequacy of the physical plant, the types of materials available, the number of students served, as well as compliance with the proposal. At some schools, the summer lunch program was in progress and the team monitored this activity as well.

FINDINGS

1. Every site visited easily met the minimal requirements for student enrollment. In most instances, the program was over-populated. The possible impact of the vacation plans of participating students was offset by over-subscribing the number of students initially registered. The project directors also shifted staffing assignments where pupil enrollment warranted this.
2. An attempt had been made at each site to use adjoining classrooms with cross-ventilation as well as easy access to student lavatories and the school's general office (a telephone). This preplanning maximized security on-site and minimized movement in the building. The general up-keep of the building by the custodial staff was on a par with regular school services provided during the term. Only one site was identified as not meeting the standards prescribed by the Board of Education.
3. Various approaches to the grouping of students were used by the staff. These included grouping on reading level, grade level, or special need.
4. Each pupil was responsible for the maintenance of his individual work folder. Pupil work sheets were available for review by the team. All work had been corrected in a timely fashion. Progress by the pupils in the writing component was easily evidenced by the improved content and appearance of their assignments.
5. Individualization of instruction primarily occurred in the reading component. Group assignments were more the rule in the areas of mathematics and written expression. The availability of a wide range of reading materials for use by the teacher appeared to be a factor in their ability to individualize instruction.

6. Dictionaries, newspapers, class libraries, booklets emphasizing specific reading skills (Reading for Content, etc.) as well as SRA kits were in ample supply. The cooperation of regular building principals in providing this equipment should be noted. Without this support the program could not possibly have begun the first week.

7. The enthusiasm exhibited by students and staff for the summer activities was clearly evident. Students knew why they were there and were stimulated to do a good job and improve their basic skills. The team members had to remind themselves that these students had been "failing" in the regular program!

8. The reinforcement of this positive image was evident in the attractive bulletin boards displaying pupils' work at each site and the weekly newsletters distributed to parents.

9. In every site but one, students were diligently at work and the teaching staff had effectively introduced an orderly but uninhibited atmosphere.

10. Personal parent contact was limited in the summer program. Communications sent home to parents on their child's progress and the weekly newsletters were the primary connection between school and home. An invitation to "drop-in" was extended in the first newsletter. Unfortunately, this type of invitation did not encourage meaningful parent participation. Workshops on how to support and maintain the gains in basic skills achieved in the summer might well have attracted a number of parents, inasmuch as parent support is not measured only by their physical presence in a school building. The good attendance on the part of students was also indicative of parent support.

OBSERVATIONS

1. Special mention must be made of the leadership provided by the co/supervisors, Mr. Chester Cohen and Mr. George Gallego. Their careful attention to minute details enhanced the implementation of the program. All possible situations were anticipated and a plan of action developed:

    a. over-enrollment to offset attendance problems
    b. a substitute teacher list provided to all teaching staff to ensure teacher coverage at each site
    c. a weekly bulletin to all staff outlining expectations of the supervisors
    d. the designing of a reporting system to parents on student progress

    The decision not to order special supplies for the program, but to creatively use existing materials in the schools contributed to the maximizing of instructional time for the students.

    The positive reception by staff of the parent monitoring team at every site visited should also be credited to the leadership of the program. We extend our thanks for a "job" well done!

2. The parent monitoring team learning experience should also be mentioned.

    The purpose of the team was twofold:

    a. to enable parents to use the skills acquired in the Parent Involvement Program
    b. to provide a first hand parent review of Title I services for PAC members

This report fulfills our second goal. More importantly, however, was the growth exhibited by team members over the 3 day visitations. One the first day, every team member found it necessary to personally visit each room and make her own notes. By the third day, the team approach had come into play, primarily because of the trust and confidence of the team members that they could depend on one another's observation. This was an unexpected but significant outcome experienced by the parent team.

This report is submitted by Jean DePesa on behalf of

Gloria Skerrit - P. 100
Neola Woods - I. 131
Shirley Wilson - P. 138
Celeste Parron - P. 119
Jerry Sanchez - United Bronx Parents

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Serious consideration should be given to the continued expenditure of Title I funds during the summer months.
2. The decision to provide summer remediation should be made no later than December/ January.
3. The proposal should be developed in a timely fashion to enable full participation by parents and staff at each school involved.
4. The hiring of staff should take place as early as possible to maximize the number of staff applying. Vacation plans affected many possible applicants.
5. Careful review of the teacher/paraprofessional ratio should be made. The positive contribution of the paraprofessionals was minimized by their rotation from class to class. The expertise of some of the paraprofessionals in specific curriculum areas was not creatively used in the program.

6. Consideration should be given to student progress made in relation to promotion and class placement in the regular program.

7. A parent involvement component should be developed emphasizing orientation sessions, "how-to" workshops, and the reconnection of parents to the school system.

8. Time and funds for a pupil snack break and at least one or two trips should be included on any proposal developed. Competition with recreational programs in maintaining the interest and attendance of pupils must be addressed.

9. Coordination of summer lunch sites to remediation sites should be made. This additional incentive to attract student participation should not be ignored.

10. In those communities where the need exists, a special consideration should be made to provide remediation in their native language.

11. The availability of reduced fare transportation passes should be investigated. The location of our I.S. and J.H.S. may create an additional burden for some students.

12. An investigation should be made of all possible resources in tax levy, PSEN and special grants to further expand the program to a broader community.

ACHIEVEMENT IN THE SUMMER PROGRAM

TESTING PROCEDURE

The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test was administered to 1,160 pupils at the beginning of the summer program. All subtests were taken and a stanine profile and grade equivalent scores were derived for each pupil. These were used to guide instruction in keeping with observed needs.

At the end of the program, a similar procedure was followed. Because maintenance of reading gains acquired during the school year was the major objective of the summer program, an analysis was made of pretest and posttest scores.

Of the pupils enrolled, 1,053 took both the pretest and the posttest and are, therefore, the subjects of the achievement evaluation.

Table 1. Pupils in the Pretest and Posttest Sessions

Test Level	Grades	Number
Red	1-2	211
Green	3-4	347
Brown	5-8	479
Blue	9	16

FINDINGS

The reading comprehension subtest was the basis of the analysis. Pupils whose grade equivalent score remained the same on the pretest and posttest, or varied within one or two decimal numerals (months) in either direction, were considered to have sustained whatever reading levels they had achieved during the year. In those instances where the variation was plus or minus three or more decimal numerals (months) pupils were considered to have gained or lost in reading skill during the time of the program. Because of the rounding of numbers, per cents may be slightly above or below 100.

Table 2. Results of the Reading Program

		Gain		Maintenance		Loss	
Grade	N	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-2	211	86	40.8	92	43.6	33	15.6
3-4	347	159	45.8	111	32.0	77	22.2
5-8	479	250	52.2	149	31.1	80	16.7
9	16	8	50.2	2	12.5	6	37.5

As can be seen in Table 2, 503 pupils in the summer program made appreciable gains in reading. This represents 47.8 per cent of the 1,053 pupils who were pre- and posttested. An additional 354 (33.6 per cent) retained their reading skills during the two months of the program, making for a total of 81.4 per cent of the pupils for whom the results were positive.

Of those who seemed to have lost ground during this time, the largest proportion was in grade 9. Further review might indicate possible reasons: individual motivation, instructional techniques, failure syndrome, peer pressure or other low response factors.

From the review of achievement test scores, it is apparent that the Summer Title I and Impact Aid Reading Program was a success for most pupils.

APPENDIX

BOARD OF EDUCATION
City of New York
Office of School District 8
1967 TURNBULL AVENUE
BRONX, N. Y. 10473
822-2000

Max Messer
Community Superintendent

John A. Loffr
Executive Assist
Rosario M. Cont
District Manager
Business & Administrat

CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

District 8 Parental Involvement Program On Site Visit
(District 8 Summer Reading Program)

Parent Checklist *

Preparation -

_____ Participated in District 8 Workshop on "How to Make an On-site Visit"

_____ Reviewed District 8 Summer Program Proposal

_____ Participated in interview of Program Supervisors, prior to visit.

General Observations - (use of building)

_____ An aide is posted at entrance.

_____ Request for reason for visit is made by aide.

_____ Sign-in book is available

_____ Rules for visitors are in evidence.

_____ Is there unusual traffic in halls at other than change of classes?

_____ Are there general rules for use of lavatories?

_____ Is there a food program available?

_____ Has it been coordinated with the Reading Program?

Number of students present

Room 1 _____

Room 2 _____

Room 3 _____

Number of staff available _____ _____ _____
Room 1 Room 2 Room 3

_____ Has an attempt been made to provide adequate space for program in relation to number of participants?

_____ Has attention been paid to set up of furniture - areas of room - to compliment program?

_____ - Is there evidence of children's work on display? Is it current? Has it been corrected.

_____ Is there evidence of individual instruction?

_____ Is teacher using group lesson method?

_____ Is Paraprofessional working with a small group? Individual child?

_____ Are individual folders available for each student? Has work been corrected?

_____ Is individuality of instruction supported by materials in folders?

_____ Identify types of material being used by students:

Teacher made _____

formal publications _____

newspapers _____

other _____

Basic Skills Instruction -

Reading Process (check activity in progress during visit)

_____ Skills development

_____ Reading for comprehension

_____ Oral language skills

_____ Vocabulary

Writing Process

_____ Use of Wedge Curriculum (beginning at Grade 5)

_____ Narrative or expository writing

_____ Sentence structure

_____ Grammatical usage

Mathematical Process -

_____ Reading Math problem

_____ Explain mathematical word problems

Language Development -E.S.L. Student

_____ Is a program available for Non-English speaking students?

Parental Involvement -

_____ Letters sent home to parents

_____ Progress report to parents

_____ Special meeting for parents

_____ Newsletter for parents

_____ Other (describe)

* Checklist developed for Parent Involvement Program by
Jean DePesa, Chairperson
Parent Development Committee

Notes/Observations: